

1 Michael D. Braun (CA Bar #167416)  
2 BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.  
3 12400 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 920  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90025  
5 Tel: (310) 442-7755  
6 Fax: (310) 442-7756

7 **Liaison Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class**

8 Maya Saxena  
9 Joseph E. White III  
10 SAXENA WHITE P.A.  
11 2424 North Federal Highway, Suite 257  
12 Boca Raton, FL 33431  
13 Tel: (561) 394-3399  
14 Fax: (561) 394-3382

15 Michael A. Swick  
16 Kim E. Miller (CA Bar #178370)  
17 KAHN GAUTHIER SWICK, LLC  
18 12 East 41st St., 12th Floor  
19 New York, NY10017  
20 Tel: (212) 696-3730  
21 Fax: (504) 455-1498

22 Lewis Kahn  
23 KAHN GAUTHIER SWICK, LLC  
24 650 Poydras Street, Suite 2150  
25 New Orleans, LA 70130  
26 Tel: (504) 455-1400  
27 Fax: (504) 455-1498

28 **Lead Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class**

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2  
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4  
5 ADRIAN MONGELI, Individually, And )  
6 On Behalf Of All Others Similarly Situated, )  
7 )  
8 Plaintiff, )  
9 )  
10 vs. )  
11 )  
12 TERAYON COMMUNICATION )  
13 SYSTEMS, INC., ZAKI RAKIB, JERRY )  
14 D. CHASE, MARK A. RICHMAN, )  
15 EDWARD LOPEZ, RAY FRITZ, CAROL )  
16 LUSTENADER, MATTHEW MILLER, )  
17 SHLOMO RAKIB, DOUG SABELLA, )  
18 CHRISTOPHER SCHAEPE, MARK )  
19 SLAVEN, LEWIS SOLOMON, HOWARD )  
20 W. SPEAKS, ARTHUR T. TAYLOR, )  
21 DAVID WOODROW, and ERNST & )  
22 YOUNG, LLP )  
23 )  
24 Defendants. )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )

29 **CASE NO.: 3-06-CV-03936 MJJ**

30 **CLASS ACTION**

31 **LEAD PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF  
32 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
33 OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF ERNST &  
34 YOUNG TO DISMISS AMENDED CLASS  
35 ACTION COMPLAINT**

36 **DATE: July 24, 2007**  
37 **TIME: 9:30 A.M.**  
38 **CTRM: 11, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

3	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
4	I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
5	II. STATEMENT OF ISSUE PRESENTED .....	3
6	III. STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	3
7	IV. ARGUMENT .....	3
8	A. Plaintiff Has Properly Pled Violations of the Exchange Act Against E&Y .....	3
9	B. Plaintiff's Allegations Raise a Strong Inference of Scienter .....	6
10	1. E&Y Had Motive to Participate in the Terayon Accounting Fraud .....	8
11	2. Plaintiff's Allegations of E&Y's Role in the Scheme Satisfy the Scienter Pleading Requirement .....	9
12	3. The Terayon Insiders' Sales Support a Strong Inference of Scienter .....	11
13	4. Allegations Based on Statements from a Former Employee in the Accounting Department Support a Strong Inference of Scienter .....	11
14	5. E&Y's Knowledge or Reckless Disregard of Terayon's Problems May Be Inferred from E&Y's Failure to Recognize and Respond to Red Flags .....	12
15	6. E&Y's Failure to Follow GAAP Provides Independent Proof of Scienter .....	13
16	V. CONCLUSION .....	15

1 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

2		3	FEDERAL CASES	
4	<i>CMNY Capital, L.P. v. Deloitte &amp; Touche</i> , 821 F. Supp. 152 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) . . . . .	5	13	
6	<i>In re Consol. Capital Sec. Litig.</i> , 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19864 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 1990) . . . . .	7	4	
7	<i>In re Cylink Sec. Litig.</i> , 178 F. Supp. 2d 1077 (N.D. Cal. 2001) . . . . .	8	14	
9	<i>DSAM Global Value Fund v. Altris Software, Inc.</i> , 288 F.3d 385 (9th Cir. 2002) . . . . .	10	14	
10	<i>Danis v. USN Communs., Inc.</i> , 73 F. Supp. 2d 923 (N.D. Ill. 1999) . . . . .	11	13	
12	<i>In re Dura Pharm., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 452 F. Supp. 1005 (S.D. Cal. 2006) . . . . .	13	3	
14	<i>Eminence Capital, L.L.C. v. Aspeon, Inc.</i> , 316 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 2003) . . . . .	15	15	
15	<i>In re First Merchs. Acceptance Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17760, (N.D. Ill. Nov. 4, 1998) . . . . .	16	14	
17	<i>In re Fleming Cos. Secs. &amp; Derivative Litig.</i> , 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26488 (E.D. Tex. June 10, 2004) . . . . .	18	7	
18	<i>Hall v. City of Santa Barbara</i> , 833 F.2d 1270 (9th Cir. 1986) . . . . .	19	3	
20	<i>In re Homestore.com, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 252 F. Supp. 2d 1018 (C.D. Cal. 2003) . . . . .	21	10	
21	<i>Lilley v. Charren</i> , 936 F. Supp. 708 (N.D. Cal. 1996) . . . . .	22	4	
22	<i>In re McKesson Hboc, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 126 F. Supp. 2d 1248 (N.D. Cal. 2000) . . . . .	23	14	
24	<i>Miller v. Material Scis. Corp.</i> , 9 F. Supp. 2d 925 (N.D. Ill. 1998) . . . . .	25	12	
25	<i>No. 84 Employer-Teamster Joint Council Pension Trust Fund v. Am. West Holding Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 920 (9th Cir. 2003) . . . . .	26	3, 6, 10	
27	<i>Novak v. Kasaks</i> , 216 F.3d 300 (2d. Cir. 2000) . . . . .	28	10	

1	<i>In re Nuko Info. Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 199 F.R.D. 338 (N.D. Cal. 2000) .....	8
2	<i>Ponce v. S.E.C.</i> , 345 F.3d 722 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	9
4	<i>Rehm v. Eagle Fin. Corp.</i> , 954 F. Supp. 1246 (N.D. Ill. 1997) .....	14
5	<i>Ronconi v. Larkin</i> , 253 F.3d 423 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	6
7	<i>In re Silicon Graphics Sec. Litig.</i> , 183 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	3, 6
8	<i>In re SmarTalk Teleservs., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 124 F. Supp. 2d 505 (S.D. Ohio 2000) .....	12
10	<i>In re Software Toolworks, Inc.</i> , 50 F.3d 615 (9th Cir. 1994) .....	9
11	<i>In re Stone &amp; Webster, Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , 414 F.3d 187 (1st Cir. 2005) .....	8
13	<i>In re Transcrypt Int'l Sec. Litig.</i> , 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17540 (D. Neb. Nov. 4, 1999) .....	13
14	<i>In re Wells Fargo Sec. Litig.</i> , 12 F.3d 922 (9th Cir. 1993) .....	8
16	<i>In re WorldCom, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10863 (S.D.N.Y. June 25, 2003) .....	8, 10
17	<i>In re Worlds of Wonder Sec. Litig.</i> , 35 F.3d 1407 (9th Cir. 1994) .....	14

#### FEDERAL STATUTES

20	15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(1) .....	4
21	15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(2) .....	6

1 Plaintiff Adrian Mongeli (“Plaintiff”) respectfully submits his Memorandum of Points and  
 2 Authorities in Opposition to the Motion of Ernst & Young, LLP (“E&Y”) to Dismiss the Amended  
 3 Class Action Complaint (“Complaint”).

4 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 In its Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss the Amended  
 6 Class Action Complaint (“E&Y’s Brf.”), E&Y argues that the Complaint should be dismissed because  
 7 Plaintiff has failed to plead particularized facts giving rise to a strong inference that E&Y acted with  
 8 scienter, as required under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (“PSLRA”). E&Y’s  
 9 motion to dismiss should be denied in its entirety because Plaintiff has adequately alleged all of the  
 10 required elements for claims under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and has pled  
 11 particularized facts giving rise to a strong inference that E&Y acted with scienter with respect to its  
 12 participation in the accounting fraud at Terayon Communication Systems, Inc. (“Terayon” or “the  
 13 Company), as required by the PSLRA.

14 Plaintiff asserts that E&Y, Terayon’s independent outside auditor, participated in a scheme to  
 15 defraud the Company’s shareholders who purchased Terayon securities between June 28, 2001 and  
 16 March 1, 2006 (the “Class Period”). Plaintiff contends that during the Class Period, Defendants  
 17 knowingly or recklessly published a series of statements which were materially false and misleading  
 18 at the time of such publication, and which omitted information necessary to legitimize Defendants’  
 19 statements in light of such omissions. Plaintiff further alleges that several individual defendants  
 20 engaged in improper insider sales, collectively reaping millions of dollars in proceeds at the direct  
 21 expense of Plaintiff and the class.

22 Within the Class Period and until its surprising resignation as Terayon’s auditor in September  
 23 2005, E&Y was a necessary, indeed critical, aid in Terayon’s fraudulent scheme to artificially inflate  
 24 the stock price of the Company through materially false and misleading statements with respect to  
 25 purported record-setting financial results and projections. In truth, these results were attributable to  
 26 improper accounting practices – including improper revenue recognition – which resulted in a  
 27 significant and material overstatement of Terayon’s revenues.

28

1        Although obvious warning signs of these improper accounting practices abounded, E&Y  
 2 intentionally or with deliberate recklessness ignored the “red flags” that were present at Terayon prior  
 3 to and during the Class Period. These warning signs included, among others, an earlier settlement of  
 4 a securities fraud action involving the same cast of characters (“Terayon Earlier Securities Fraud  
 5 Action”), numerous GAAP violations, suspicious insider sales amounting to nearly \$4 million in  
 6 proceeds, resistance to application of correct accounting principles which would have had a negative  
 7 effect on financial results, as well as a complete lack of internal controls and procedures, ultimately  
 8 leading to a formal SEC investigation, the delisting of Terayon from the NASDAQ, and a restatement  
 9 of 72 months’ worth of financial results. Had E&Y fulfilled its obligations as Terayon’s independent  
 10 outside auditor, such “red flags” would have raised E&Y’s suspicions and would have forced it to  
 11 conduct significant testing and review of Defendants’ financial disclosures and reports.

12        Despite the prevalence of these warning signs, and in violation of its duties as an independent  
 13 outside auditor, E&Y failed to ask the appropriate and necessary questions which a reasonable and  
 14 independent auditor would inquire in the course of due diligence, failed to disclose any material  
 15 problems with Terayon’s financial reporting until just months prior to its abrupt resignation, and failed  
 16 to deliver a public objection to the Company’s characterization of certain control deficiencies as one-  
 17 time events that had already been substantially remedied or cured, and that were not expected to  
 18 continue to have a material impact on the Company or its financial reporting.

19        Because E&Y was the sole independent auditor during the majority of the Class Period, class  
 20 members relied on the veracity of E&Y’s confirmations that Terayon was reporting accurate financial  
 21 results in accordance with GAAP when they purchased Terayon securities. Investors relied on those  
 22 results, confirmed by E&Y, showing that the Company’s business was growing in key areas. As a  
 23 result, class members suffered millions of dollars in losses when they learned that Terayon had been  
 24 reporting false and misleading financial results throughout the Class Period with E&Y’s full knowledge  
 25 and participation.

26        ///

27        ///

28        ///

1       **II. STATEMENT OF ISSUE PRESENTED**

2       Whether the Complaint adequately states claims under the Exchange Act against E&Y where  
 3       the alleged material misrepresentations and omissions of E&Y, along with its intentional or deliberately  
 4       reckless ignorance of obvious “red flags” concerning Terayon’s fraudulent accounting practices and  
 5       improper insider sales, when taken as a whole, support a strong inference of scienter.

6       **III. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

7       Motions to dismiss are viewed with disfavor and particular skepticism to ensure that plaintiffs  
 8       are not denied a full and fair opportunity to present their claims. *Hall v. City of Santa Barbara*, 833  
 9       F.2d 1270, 1274 (9th Cir. 1986). In considering a motion to dismiss, all allegations of material facts  
 10      in the complaint are taken as true and construed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *In re Silicon*  
 11      *Graphics Sec. Litig.*, 183 F.3d 970, 983 (9th Cir. 1999). A complaint should not be dismissed unless  
 12      it appears beyond a doubt that the plaintiff cannot prove any set of facts in support of the claim that  
 13      would entitle him to relief. *No. 84 Employer-Teamster Joint Council Pension Trust Fund v. Am. West*  
 14      *Holding Corp.*, 320 F.3d 920, 931 (9th Cir. 2003). The Court cannot parse and dismiss each allegation  
 15      one by one. Rather, it must determine whether in the final analysis, “*the total of plaintiffs’ allegations*  
 16      . . . [is] sufficient to create a strong inference that defendants acted with deliberate or conscious  
 17      recklessness.” *In re Dura Pharms., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 452 F. Supp. 1005, 1017 (S.D. Cal. 2006)  
 18      (emphasis added) (quotations and citations omitted).

19       **IV. ARGUMENT**

20       **A. Plaintiff Has Properly Pled Violations of the Exchange Act Against E&Y**

21       E&Y argues that Plaintiff failed to properly plead claims against E&Y for violations of Section  
 22      10(b) of the Exchange Act because he has failed to particularize his charge of fraud under Rule 9(b) and  
 23      failed to plead facts giving rise to a strong inference that E&Y acted with scienter. E&Y’s Brf. at 5.  
 24      E&Y’s argument is untenable because, as set forth in greater detail below, Plaintiff has pled facts in  
 25      support of his allegations sufficient to satisfy the pleading standards of the PSLRA.<sup>1</sup>

26  
 27       

---

  
 28       <sup>1</sup> E&Y has joined in the Motion to Dismiss of Terayon Communication Systems, Inc. and  
 the Individual Defendants with respect to the loss causation arguments presented therein. (E&Y’s  
 Brf. at 1). Accordingly, Plaintiff incorporates by reference Section IV.C of his Opposition to the

1 Pursuant to the PSLRA, a complaint must specify each statement alleged to have been  
 2 misleading, the reason or reasons why the statement is misleading, and if an allegation regarding the  
 3 statement or omission is made on information, the complaint shall state with particularity all facts on  
 4 which the belief is formed. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(1). By alleging with particularity E&Y's  
 5 materially misleading statements and omissions that allowed Terayon to publish projections and  
 6 financial results that were seriously flawed, misleading and lacking in rational basis, Plaintiff has met  
 7 his pleading burden under the PSLRA.

8 Plaintiff alleges that, during the Class Period, Defendants published a series of statements which  
 9 were materially false and misleading when published, and which omitted information necessary to make  
 10 Defendants' statements not materially false and misleading. Plaintiff further contends that at the time  
 11 these false and misleading statements were being issued throughout the Class Period – which artificially  
 12 inflated the price of Terayon stock – several of the individual defendants were engaging in improper  
 13 insider sales, collectively reaping millions of dollars in proceeds at the direct expense of the class  
 14 members. Despite E&Y's obligations as Terayon's outside auditor to properly test and review the  
 15 Company's disclosures and reports, and disclose any material problems with the Company's financial  
 16 reporting, E&Y intentionally or with deliberate recklessness ignored the numerous "red flags" that  
 17 surrounded Terayon during the Class Period. These improprieties were clear warning signs which  
 18 should have raised E&Y's suspicions in order to protect the interests of the investing public.

19 E&Y cites cases and articulates relevant pleading principles but offers no meaningful analysis  
 20 of the facts alleged in the Complaint. It is not enough for E&Y to simply quote legal standards; it must  
 21 analyze the totality of the allegations related to its conduct. Moreover, E&Y conveniently glosses over  
 22 a number of significant allegations that support a strong inference of scienter.

23  
 24 Motion to Dismiss of Terayon Communication Systems, Inc. and the Individual Defendants, Docket  
 25 No. 53. Furthermore, Defendants' and E&Y's loss causation defense is fact-sensitive and cannot be  
 26 appropriately determined at this stage of the proceedings. *See In re Consol. Capital Sec. Litig.*, No.  
 27 C 85 7332 AJZ, 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19864 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 1990); *Lilley v. Charren*, 936 F.  
 28 Supp. 708, 718 (N.D. Cal. 1996) ("Plaintiffs allege that as a result of false and misleading  
 statements Kenetech securities were artificially inflated in price for two years, and include other  
 allegations relating to causation throughout the complaint. At this preliminary pleading stage, these  
 allegations are sufficient") (citations omitted).

1 E&Y's argument fails because Plaintiff has identified, in significant detail, the material  
 2 misrepresentations, omissions and violations that E&Y committed during the Class Period:

- 3 - Throughout the Class Period, E&Y knew that its audit reports would be  
 4 disseminated to and relied upon by investors, and that it owed duties to  
 5 Terayon's investors as the outside independent auditor for the Company. (See,  
 6 e.g., ¶¶ 16, 49).
- 7 - The allegations of fraud and misrepresentation in the Terayon Earlier Securities  
 8 Fraud Action raised significant red flags and ongoing concerns regarding the  
 9 accuracy and completeness of the Company's disclosures and the adequacy of  
 10 the Company's controls and procedures, and these red flags should have caused  
 11 E&Y to approach Terayon's audits with a very high level of skepticism and to  
 12 critically approach Defendants' disclosures and representations – especially  
 13 those related to revenues and related-party transactions. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 46-49).
- 14 - E&Y knew or recklessly disregarded that the Terayon insiders' stock sales were  
 15 highly unusual in their timing and amounts, and ignored these obvious  
 16 cautionary signs that would have allowed it to uncover Defendants' accounting  
 17 fraud. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 3, 50-51, 263-64).
- 18 - A former Terayon employee in the accounting department during the Class  
 19 Period revealed that E&Y "was not clean on this stuff", "virtually closed the  
 20 books for year end 2001 and 2000 – a "no-no", "did not try to learn the  
 21 Company's business", provided recommendations on goods received but not  
 22 invoiced that were "not valid – they should have been amortized over time",  
 23 provided invalid instructions with respect to the Thomson transaction in order  
 24 to appease Terayon's desire to recognize the revenue from the transaction  
 25 immediately, failed to ask the appropriate and necessary questions in the course  
 26 of its due diligence, failed to insist on the application of SOP 97-2 with regard  
 27 to software revenue recognition, did not focus on the Terayon account and did  
 28 not have any material discussions with the vice president of Terayon who ran  
 each of its three business areas. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 52-55).
- E&Y was motivated to conceal the Defendants' accounting fraud because the  
 auditor did not want to lose millions of dollars in professional fees from the  
 Terayon account, nor risk having the reputation of exposing its own clients to  
 regulatory, civil or criminal sanctions, thereby potentially costing it future clients  
 and revenue. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 5, 17, 57-58).
- E&Y's statements and confirmations contained in Terayon's SEC filings during  
 the Class Period were each materially false and misleading when made because  
 the financial statements, projections and operations reports were *not* true,  
 accurate or reliable, the financial statements were *not* GAAP compliant,  
 Terayon's internal financial accounting and disclosure controls were grossly  
 inadequate and ineffective, E&Y failed to properly test such internal controls  
 and procedures, and Terayon's internal control deficiencies were material and  
 pervasive. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 59, 64, 148, 149, 195).

1       Accordingly, the Complaint identifies with particularity E&Y's duties as the independent  
 2 outside auditor for Terayon, the warning signs that E&Y ignored which would have led a reasonably  
 3 independent and unbiased outside auditor to uncover Defendants' accounting fraud, the particulars of  
 4 the statements and omissions at issue in the Complaint, the documents in which these statements were  
 5 contained, and the reasons why the statements were false and misleading.

6       **B. Plaintiff's Allegations Raise a Strong Inference of Scienter**

7       The PSLRA requires a plaintiff to "state with particularity facts giving rise to a strong inference  
 8 that the defendant acted with the required state of mind." 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(2). In this Circuit, the  
 9 "required state of mind" is one of "deliberate or conscious recklessness." *Silicon Graphics*, 183 F.3d  
 10 at 979. Scienter may be inferred from the same set of facts that allege the falsity of the relevant  
 11 statements. *Ronconi v. Larkin*, 253 F.3d 423, 429 (9th Cir. 2002) (pleading requirements under the  
 12 PSLRA can be collapsed into a single inquiry because analysis of both requirements involves the same  
 13 set of facts). Drawing all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff, the court can then "answer the  
 14 larger question of whether [the] complaint, considered in its entirety, states facts which give rise to a  
 15 strong inference of deliberate recklessness," or knowledge. *Silicon Graphics*, 183 F.3d at 980 n.11,  
 16 983, 985.

17       E&Y's analysis concerning the adequacy of Plaintiff's individual scienter allegations is flawed  
 18 because it considers such allegations in a vacuum without examination of the larger picture. E&Y  
 19 dismisses each of these allegations one by one as failing to meet the particularity requirements of the  
 20 PSLRA. However, the individual allegations collectively, and the Complaint as a whole, should be  
 21 analyzed in assessing whether Plaintiff has pled particularized facts sufficient to support a strong  
 22 inference of scienter:

23       Under *Silicon Graphics* and its progeny, we examine *all the circumstances* in determining whether a strong inference of scienter has  
 24 been raised.... Beyond each individual allegation, we also consider  
 25 whether the *total of plaintiffs' allegations*, even though individually  
 26 lacking, are sufficient to create a strong inference that defendants acted  
 27 with deliberate or conscious recklessness.

28       *Am. West*, 320 F.3d at 937-38 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis added); *see also Ronconi*, 253 F.3d at 429 ("In considering whether a private securities fraud complaint can survive

1 dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6), we must determine whether particular facts in the complaint, taken as  
 2 a whole, raise a strong inference that defendants intentionally or [with] deliberate recklessness made  
 3 false or misleading statements.”) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Additionally, several  
 4 factors may be considered in assessing the sufficiency of scienter allegations with respect to an auditor  
 5 in particular:

6 With regard to sufficiently alleging scienter against auditors, courts have  
 7 held that in assessing the totality of the circumstances the following may  
 8 each contribute in supplying an inference that an auditor performed a  
 9 reckless or fraudulent audit: 1) red flags regarding accounting matters,  
 known accounting errors.

10 *In re Fleming Cos. Secs. & Derivative Litig.*, No. 5-03-MD-1530 (TJW), MDL-1530, 2004 U.S. Dist.  
 11 LEXIS 26488 at \*116 (E.D. Tex. June 10, 2004) (citations omitted).

12 Considered in their entirety, the facts alleged here raise a strong inference of E&Y’s scienter.  
 13 The Complaint alleges that Defendants participated in a scheme to overstate the Company’s revenues  
 14 which artificially inflated the stock price of the Company. E&Y legitimized the scheme by issuing  
 15 unqualified opinions on Terayon’s financials despite evidence that the Company’s controls and  
 16 procedures and, as a result, the Company’s projections and reported financial results, were seriously  
 17 flawed, misleading and lacking in rational basis. Plaintiff has set forth facts alleging that E&Y utterly  
 18 ignored obvious cautionary signs that would have allowed it to uncover Defendants’ accounting fraud  
 19 and the complete lack of internal controls and procedures that ultimately forced Terayon to restate 72  
 20 months of financial results. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 17, 49-56, 195).

21 Taken as a whole, the Complaint alleges, in specific detail, a scheme employed by Defendants  
 22 to publish materially false and misleading statements which artificially inflated the price of Terayon  
 23 stock. Additionally, Plaintiff has bolstered his scienter allegations by pleading that E&Y had motive  
 24 to participate in the Terayon accounting fraud, that Terayon’s public filings are replete with violations  
 25 of GAAP and related abuses, and that E&Y intentionally or with deliberate recklessness ignored the  
 26 many cautionary signs that should have alerted it to such violations. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 4, 5, 17, 55-59, 64,  
 27 77, 91, 195, 212, 244, 254-61).

28

1                   **1.       E&Y Had Motive to Participate in the Terayon Accounting Fraud**

2                   E&Y argues that it lacked any incentive to participate in the alleged fraud and that, because of  
 3 E&Y's purported lack of motive, Plaintiff's scienter allegations are necessarily contradicted. *See*  
 4 E&Y's Brf. at 16-17. Specifically, E&Y dismisses as "irrational" Plaintiff's allegations that E&Y was  
 5 motivated to participate in the alleged fraud in order to collect millions of dollars in professional fees  
 6 and avoid subjecting a client to possible civil and criminal liability, leading to a potential loss of future  
 7 business. *Id.*

8                   Although motive allegations alone do not conclusively establish scienter, Plaintiff has pled  
 9 substantial instances of Defendants' material misrepresentations and omissions in addition to motive  
 10 allegations. *See, supra*, Section IV.A. E&Y's motive and opportunity to participate in the Terayon  
 11 accounting fraud, when combined with material misrepresentations and omissions, contribute to a  
 12 strong inference of scienter. *See In re Nuko Info. Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 199 F.R.D. 338, 343 (N.D. Cal.  
 13 2000) ("motive and opportunity coupled with highly material misrepresentations or omissions may well  
 14 satisfy the standard"); *In re Wells Fargo Sec. Litig.*, 12 F.3d 922, 931 (9th Cir. 1993) (motive and  
 15 opportunity may contribute to an inference not just of recklessness, but "specific intent to commit . . .  
 16 fraud").

17                   Moreover, E&Y is wrong in suggesting that it could have no sufficient motive to engage in  
 18 securities fraud. Any notion that auditors' fees cannot serve as such a motive has been more than  
 19 discredited by the numerous other recent examples of securities frauds implicating auditors:

20                   The final allegation on which plaintiffs rely is PwC's motivation to  
 21 overlook S&W's concealment of losses in order to protect its own source  
 22 of lucrative accounting and consulting fees. We do not doubt that such  
 23 a profit motive could contribute to an auditor's decision to turn a [blind]  
 24 eye to a corporation's misleading accounting. Such allegations can thus  
 25 strengthen an inference of scienter predicated on other facts, possibly  
 26 adding sufficient strength to satisfy the strong-inference requirement of  
 27 [the] PSLRA.

28                   *In re Stone & Webster, Inc., Sec. Litig.*, 414 F.3d 187, 215 (1st Cir. 2005) (internal quotations and  
 29 citations omitted); *see also In re WorldCom, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 02 Civ. 3288 (DLC), 2003 U.S. Dist.  
 30 LEXIS 10863, at \*13 (S.D.N.Y. June 25, 2003) ("Andersen was well paid for its WorldCom work").  
 31 E&Y's no-possible-motive argument is nothing short of a contention that auditors who are paid large

1 but customary professional fees for their audits cannot violate the securities laws. Nothing in the  
 2 PSLRA comes close to supporting such an extreme view.

3 **2. Plaintiff's Allegations of E&Y's Role in the Scheme Satisfy the Scienter  
 4 Pleading Requirement**

5 In addition to possessing motive to participate in the Terayon accounting fraud, E&Y does not  
 6 and cannot rebut the inference that it acted with conscious or deliberate recklessness given the multitude  
 7 of obvious cautionary signs that would have alerted a truly independent outside auditor to the  
 8 accounting improprieties and securities fraud taking place within Terayon. E&Y audited the Terayon  
 9 financial statements prior to and during the Class Period up until its abrupt resignation as the  
 10 Company's outside auditor in September 2005. However, as it admits, E&Y did not publicly identify  
 11 or disclose any deficiencies in Terayon's internal controls or express any adverse opinions on the  
 12 Company's financial results until Terayon's Form 10-Q was filed on November 15, 2004. E&Y's Brf.  
 13 at 11. This was more than three years after the beginning of the Class Period and only months prior to  
 14 E&Y's suspicious resignation as Terayon's independent outside auditor. Predictably, months later  
 15 Terayon disclosed to the investing public that the Company would have to restate 72 months of  
 16 financial results during the Class Period due to rampant accounting violations.

17 Under these circumstances, E&Y's audit of Terayon's financial statements during the Class  
 18 Period amounted either to no audit at all, or an egregious failure to see the obvious and investigate the  
 19 Defendants' admittedly misleading accounting practices. In such cases of utter failure, the Ninth Circuit  
 20 has affirmed Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 claims against outside auditors. *See, e.g., Ponce v. S.E.C.*,  
 21 345 F.3d 722 (9th Cir. 2003); *In re Software Toolworks, Inc.*, 50 F.3d 615 (9th Cir. 1994) (scienter  
 22 requirement for a claim of deceptive conduct by the accountant was pled where allegations showing that  
 23 the accounting practices of the auditor were so deficient that the audit amounted to no audit at all, or  
 24 an egregious refusal to see the obvious, or to investigate the doubtful).

25 E&Y's argument that Plaintiff has failed to properly plead particularized facts and allegations  
 26 are further undercut by the numerous authorities that support the sufficiency of Plaintiff's scienter  
 27 allegations. In *Am. West*, the court held that allegations regarding the defendants' misleading  
 28 statements, when taken as a whole, met the stringent pleading standard of the PSLRA: "In this era of

1 corporate scandal, when insiders manipulate the market with the complicity of lawyers and accountants,  
 2 we are cautious not to raise the bar of the PSLRA any higher than that which is required under its  
 3 mandates.” 320 F.3d at 945-46. *See also Nuko Info.*, 199 F.R.D. 338 (plaintiffs who alleged overstated  
 4 revenues sufficiently alleged motive and opportunity, facts strongly suggesting that defendants knew  
 5 they were overstating revenues and that it was improper for them to do so, and violations of GAAP  
 6 regarding those transactions); *In re Homestore.com, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 252 F. Supp. 2d 1018 (C.D. Cal.  
 7 2003) (allegations sufficiently gave rise to a strong inference that the auditor acted with deliberate  
 8 recklessness and that the auditor’s conduct amounted to an egregious refusal to see the obvious when  
 9 it issued its audit opinion and substantially participated in the preparation of various quarterly reports).

10 Furthermore, the court in *Fleming Cos.* found that the allegations against an auditor, when taken  
 11 as a whole, adequately pled scienter. The court found significant the auditor’s duties to obtain and  
 12 evaluate evidence concerning the assertions made in its client’s financial statements:

13 Independent auditors are charged with obtaining and evaluating evidence  
 14 concerning the assertions made in their client’s financial statements.  
 15 Auditors are not entitled to allow representations from a company’s  
 16 management to substitute for the auditing procedures that are necessary  
 17 to provide a reasonable basis for forming an opinion regarding the  
 18 financial statements that are the subject of the audit.... Professional  
 19 auditors are required to act diligently and in good faith, and to apply a  
 20 professional skepticism to their evaluation of evidence. An auditor  
 21 should conduct the audit objectively, thoroughly and carefully. Before  
 22 certifying financial statements, an auditor should have an understanding  
 23 of the factors that may have a significant effect on the financial  
 24 statements.

25 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26488, at \*121-22 (citations omitted). If E&Y had evaluated properly the  
 26 obvious cautionary signs of improprieties prevalent in Terayon during the Class Period, it would have  
 27 discovered Defendants’ fraudulent accounting practices: “[t]he allegations identifying the steps  
 28 Andersen should have taken and failed to take, and the fraud it would have discovered if it had taken  
 those steps, create a strong inference that Andersen acted recklessly in conducting the WorldCom  
 audits.” *Worldcom*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10863, at \*22; *see also Novak v. Kasaks*, 216 F.3d 300, 308  
 (2d. Cir. 2000) (allegations that defendants “failed to review or check information that they had a duty  
 to monitor, or ignored obvious signs of fraud” are sufficient to allege recklessness).

### 3. The Terayon Insiders' Sales Support a Strong Inference of Scienter

Plaintiff incorporates by reference Section IV.A.2 from his Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss of Terayon Communication Systems, Inc. and the Individual Defendants, Docket No. 53. E&Y argues that Plaintiff failed to set forth allegations sufficient to infer that E&Y intentionally or with deliberate recklessness ignored evidence of fraud from insider stock sales. However, Plaintiff alleges, in significant detail, particularized facts sufficient to infer that E&Y consciously ignored the suspicious nature of the insider sales.

The allegations include, among others, the improper insider sales which formed a basis for the Terayon Earlier Securities Fraud Action; the suspicious sales of the Terayon insiders during the Class Period, including 300,000 shares by the Rakib brothers alone in February of 2005 – nearly *double* the number of shares sold by all insiders in the Terayon Earlier Securities Fraud Action; and the timing of these suspicious insider sales when Defendants were already contemplating the restatement, an SEC investigation was entirely foreseeable, and the Terayon Earlier Securities Fraud Action had not yet settled for \$15 million. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 3, 46-51, 235, 263-64).

Given this backdrop of improper and fraudulent business activity, the insider sales were highly questionable and should have raised the suspicions of E&Y. A reasonable and independent outside auditor would have inquired as to the propriety of these insider sales, thereby exposing the fraud taking place at Terayon. Accordingly, E&Y's intentional or deliberately reckless ignorance of the evidence of fraud from the Terayon insider stock sales provides additional support for a strong inference of scienter.

**4. Allegations Based on Statements from a Former Employee in the Accounting Department Support a Strong Inference of Scienter**

Plaintiff incorporates by reference Section IV.A.5 from his Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss of Terayon Communication Systems, Inc. and the Individual Defendants, Docket No. 53. In addition to questioning the specificity with which Plaintiff described the former employee who worked in Terayon’s accounting department during the Class Period, E&Y also questions whether the assertions of the employee create a strong inference of scienter. While Plaintiff has identified his confidential

1 source with sufficient particularity to satisfy the PSLRA, the allegations attributed to this source also  
 2 support a strong inference of scienter against E&Y.

3 In particular, the statements from the former employee reveal significant violations of GAAP  
 4 and general SEC reporting rules and regulations, improper revenue recognition and accounting direction  
 5 with respect to several accounts and transactions, and conversations between E&Y and Defendants  
 6 which confirm that E&Y allowed Defendants' biased judgments, inaccurate representations and  
 7 compromised agendas to substitute its own due diligence and investigation in applying proper  
 8 accounting principles. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 52-55). Such deficiencies and failures are corroborated by  
 9 Defendants' own concessions in the restatements of the Terayon Class Period financial reports.  
 10 Moreover, the specificity of the former employee's statements makes it clear that E&Y was aware of  
 11 the obvious cautionary signs present in Terayon during the Class Period and failed to respond to such  
 12 red flags in a manner consistent with its duties and obligations as the sole independent outside auditor  
 13 for Terayon. Accordingly, the former employee's statements provide a strong inference of scienter.

14 **5. E&Y's Knowledge or Reckless Disregard of Terayon's Problems May Be  
 15 Inferred from E&Y's Failure to Recognize and Respond to Red Flags**

16 Plaintiff alleges that E&Y consciously or with deliberate recklessness ignored the obvious  
 17 warning signs concerning Terayon's allegedly fraudulent financial reporting during the Class Period.  
 18 E&Y dismisses these allegations, stating that none of these signs "demonstrates that E&Y acted either  
 19 intentionally or with deliberate recklessness." E&Y's Brf. at 8. Indeed, E&Y's method of attacking  
 20 Plaintiff's allegations is to analyze one piece of the puzzle and conclude that this single element, by  
 21 itself, is not sufficient to support an inference of scienter. However, such allegations cannot be  
 22 examined in a vacuum without reference to the rest of the puzzle in which E&Y's conscious or  
 23 deliberately reckless behavior is clear and a strong inference of scienter is presented.

24 E&Y's conscious or deliberately reckless behavior can be inferred from the "specific, highly  
 25 suspicious facts and circumstances available to the auditor at the time of the audit." *In re SmarTalk*  
 26 *Teleservs., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 124 F. Supp. 2d 505, 514 (S.D. Ohio 2000). Furthermore, ignoring copious  
 27 "red flags" also gives rise to an inference of scienter. *Miller v. Material Scis. Corp.*, 9 F. Supp. 2d 925,  
 28 928 (N.D. Ill. 1998) ("Deliberately ignoring 'red flags' . . . can constitute the sort of recklessness

1 necessary to support § 10(b) liability.”); *Danis v. USN Communs., Inc.*, 73 F. Supp. 2d 923, 942 (N.D.  
 2 Ill. 1999) (“Plaintiffs sufficiently allege the existence of and Deloitte’s awareness of these ‘red flags’  
 3 . . . . Deloitte’s knowledge or reckless disregard of USN’s problems may be inferred.”); *In re  
 4 Transcript Int’l Sec. Litig.*, No. 4:98CV3099, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17540, at \*27-28 (D. Neb. Nov.  
 5 4, 1999) (failure to notice numerous red flags demonstrates an auditor’s recklessness); *CMNY Capital,  
 6 L.P. v. Deloitte & Touche*, 821 F. Supp. 152, 166 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (“red flags” support an inference of  
 7 scienter).

8 The numerous red flags throughout the Class Period regarding Terayon’s accounting  
 9 improprieties and securities fraud included, among others, the settlement of the Terayon Earlier  
 10 Securities Fraud Action, violations of GAAP and SEC reporting rules and regulations, suspicious  
 11 insider sales, resistance to application of SOP 97-2, improper revenue recognition and third-party  
 12 transactions, and ineffective internal controls and procedures, all culminating in the restatement of 72  
 13 months of Terayon financial reports. Such extensive warning signs contribute to a finding of E&Y’s  
 14 scienter:

15 The fact that an auditor ignored red flags constitutes strong evidence of  
 16 intentional or reckless conduct. Although the existence of a restatement  
 17 may not by itself satisfy the scienter requirement, a restatement can tip  
 18 the scales in favor of a finding of scienter when the restatement is  
 19 viewed with the totality of the circumstances surrounding the  
 restatement. A restatement adds significant weight to the scienter  
 calculus due to the magnitude of a restatement, the repetitiveness of  
 GAAP violations requiring the restatement, and the simplicity of the  
 accounting principles that were violated.

20 *Fleming Cos.*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26488, at \*116-17 (citations omitted). Because the Complaint  
 21 is replete with allegations of red flags and support for the conclusion that E&Y’s conduct amounted to  
 22 no audit at all or refusal to see the obvious or investigate the doubtful, Plaintiff has properly pled  
 23 scienter.

#### 24           **6.       E&Y’s Failure to Follow GAAP Provides Independent Proof of Scienter**

25 Plaintiff incorporates by reference Section IV.A.1 from his Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss  
 26 of Terayon Communication Systems, Inc. and the Individual Defendants, Docket No. 53. E&Y’s  
 27 deliberately reckless or intentional failure to follow GAAP resulted in the filing of materially false  
 28 financial statements, providing an independent basis by which to find E&Y liable under Section 10(b).

1 E&Y argues that GAAP violations, without more, do not establish scienter, citing to *DSAM Global*  
 2 *Value Fund v. Altris Software, Inc.*, 288 F.3d 385 (9th Cir. 2002) in support. E&Y's Brf. at 9.  
 3 However, *DSAM* is distinguishable from the instant action in that the plaintiff there failed to allege *any*  
 4 facts other than the GAAP violations to establish that the auditor acted with scienter. *DSAM*, 288 F.3d  
 5 at 390-91. Furthermore, the auditor in *DSAM* withdrew its audit opinion immediately upon learning  
 6 of such accounting violations. *Id.* at 388.

7 E&Y attempts to distort the content of Plaintiff's assertions and examines the allegations of  
 8 GAAP violations without context. Such characterization is an effort to mask obvious improprieties and  
 9 violations with the argument that this allegation, alone, is not sufficient to meet the standards of the  
 10 PSLRA.

11 Moreover, this Circuit has held that GAAP violations, combined with other circumstances  
 12 indicating unlawful activities, provide strong circumstantial evidence of scienter. *See In re McKesson*  
 13 *Hboc, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 126 F. Supp. 2d 1248, 1272-73 (N.D. Cal. 2000) ("[W]hen significant GAAP  
 14 violations are described with particularity in the complaint, they may provide powerful indirect evidence  
 15 of scienter. After all, books do not cook themselves."); *In re Cylink Sec. Litig.*, 178 F. Supp. 2d 1077,  
 16 1082-83 (N.D. Cal. 2001) (GAAP violations that "constituted a widespread and significant inflation of  
 17 revenue . . . a strong inference arises that senior management intentionally misstated earnings"). Even  
 18 E&Y's own reference to *In re Worlds of Wonder Sec. Litig.*, 35 F.3d 1407, 1426 (9th Cir. 1994),  
 19 suggests as much: "alleged violations of GAAP or SEC regulations, *without more*, do not establish  
 20 scienter." E&Y's Brf. at 9 (emphasis added). E&Y's violations with respect to the Terayon accounting  
 21 fraud include much more than a mere honest error in accounting or judgment by a truly independent  
 22 outside auditor.

23 Additionally, the huge magnitude of the misrepresented financial information also supports a  
 24 strong inference of scienter. *See, e.g., Rehm v. Eagle Fin. Corp.*, 954 F. Supp. 1246, 1256 (N.D. Ill.  
 25 1997) (large accounting errors strengthen inference of scienter). In *In re First Merchs. Acceptance*  
 26 *Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 97 C 2715, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17760, at \* 30-32 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 4, 1998),  
 27 the court held that allegations of specific GAAP violations, combined with other circumstances  
 28 suggesting fraudulent intent, constituted strong circumstantial evidence of scienter.

1       Here, Plaintiff specifically pleads that Terayon's semi-annual and annual reports and other  
2 public filings during the Class Period violated GAAP. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 4, 59, 64, 77, 91, 195, 212, 244,  
3 254-61). Plaintiff further alleges that as a direct result of Terayon's GAAP violations, the Company's  
4 public filings during the Class Period were necessarily false and misleading. Furthermore, as a result  
5 of Defendants' GAAP violations, Terayon was ultimately required to restate 72 months' worth of  
6 financial reports, the Company was delisted from the NASDAQ, and the SEC launched a formal  
7 investigation of the Company. When the truth finally emerged, a financial picture that was materially  
8 different from that which Defendants and E&Y publicly represented throughout the Class Period came  
9 to light. Accordingly, the magnitude of E&Y's failures during the Class Period provides strong  
10 circumstantial evidence of its scienter.

## 11 | V. CONCLUSION

12 For all of the foregoing reasons, the Court should deny in its entirety E&Y's Motion to Dismiss  
13 the Amended Class Action Complaint. If any part of E&Y's motion is granted, Plaintiff respectfully  
14 requests leave to amend. *Eminence Capital, L.L.C. v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1051-53 (9th Cir.  
15 2003).

Respectfully submitted,

17 | Dated: May 7, 2007

Michael D. Braun  
BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.

19

### **Liaison Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class**

Maya Saxena  
Joseph E. White III  
SAXENA WHITE P.A.  
2424 North Federal Highway, Suite 257  
Boca Raton, FL 33431  
Tel: (561) 394-3399  
Fax: (561) 394-3382

1 Lewis Kahn  
2 KAHN GAUTHIER SWICK, LLC  
3 650 Poydras Street, Suite 2150  
4 New Orleans, LA 70130  
5 Tel: (504) 455-1400  
6 Fax: (504) 455-1498

7 Michael A. Swick  
8 Kim E. Miller  
9 KAHN GAUTHIER SWICK, LLC  
10 12 East 41st St., 12th Floor  
11 New York, NY10017  
12 Tel: (212) 696-3730  
13 Fax: (504) 455-1498

14 **Lead Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## PROOF OF SERVICE

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
3 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )ss.)

4 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, I am over the age of 18 and  
5 not a party to the within action; my business address is 12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 920, Los  
Angeles, CA 90025.

On May 7, 2007, using the Northern District of California's Electronic Case Filing System, with the ECF ID registered to Michael D. Braun, I filed and served the document(s) described as:

**LEAD PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF ERNST & YOUNG TO DISMISS AMENDED CLASS  
ACTION COMPLAINT**

10 The ECF System is designed to automatically generate an e-mail message to all parties in the case, which constitutes service. According to the ECF/PACER system, for this case, the parties served are as follows:

Lionel Z. Glancy, Esq. info@glancylaw.com

Michael M. Goldberg, Esq. info@glancylaw.com

Kim E. Miller, Esq. [kim.miller@kgscounsel.com](mailto:kim.miller@kgscounsel.com)

**Counsel for Plaintiffs**

6 Patrick Edward Gibbs, Esq. patrick.gibbs@lw.com  
zoila.aurora@lw.com

## 7 | Counsel for Defendant

8 | **Terayon Communication Systems, Inc.  
and Individual Defendants**

9 Sheila Anil Jambekar, Esq. sjambekar@morganlewis.com

20 John H. Hemann, Esq. [jhemann@morganlewis.com](mailto:jhemann@morganlewis.com)

21 | Counsel for Defendant Ernst & Young LLP

22 On May 7, 2007, I served the document(s) described as:

**LEAD PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF ERNST & YOUNG TO DISMISS AMENDED CLASS  
ACTION COMPLAINT**

25 by placing a true copy(ies) thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as follows:

26 | //

27 | //

28 | //

1 Maya Saxena, Esq.  
2 Joseph E. White III, Esq.  
3 SAXENA WHITE P.A.  
4 2424 North Federal Highway, Suite 257  
5 Boca Raton, FL 33431  
6 Tel: (561) 394-3399  
7 Fax: (561) 394-3382

8 Lewis Kahn, Esq.  
9 KAHN GAUTHIER SWICK, LLC  
10 650 Poydras Street, Suite 2150  
11 New Orleans, LA 70130  
12 Tel: (504) 455-1400  
13 Fax: (504) 455-1498

14 Michael A. Swick, Esq.  
15 KAHN GAUTHIER SWICK, LLC  
16 12 East 41st St., 12th Floor  
17 New York, NY 10017  
18 Tel: (212) 696-3730  
19 Fax: (504) 455-1498

20 **Lead Counsel for Plaintiff**  
21 **Adrian G. Mongeli and the Class**

22 Michael J. Lawson, Esq.  
23 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
24 One Market  
25 Spear Street Tower  
26 San Francisco, CA 94105  
27 Tel: (415) 442-1000  
28 Fax: (415) 442-1001

29 Bruce M. Cormier, Esq.  
30 Joel E. Bonner, Esq.  
31 ERNST & YOUNG LLP  
32 1225 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
33 Washington, D.C. 20036  
34 Tel: (202) 327-7603  
35 Fax: (202) 327-7601

36 **Counsel for Defendant**  
37 **Ernst & Young LLP**

38 I served the above document(s) as follows:

39 BY MAIL. I am familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence  
40 for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with  
41 postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware  
42 that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage  
43 meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in an affidavit.

44

45

1 I declare, pursuant to Civil L.R. 23-2, that on the date hereof I served a copy of the above-listed  
2 document(s) on the Securities Class Action Clearinghouse by electronic mail through the following  
electronic mail address provided by the Securities Class Action Clearinghouse:

3 scac@law.stanford.edu

4 I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service  
was made.

5 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the above is true and  
6 correct.

7 Executed on May 7, 2007, at Los Angeles, California 90025.

8  
9 /S/ LEITZA MOLINAR

10 Leitza Molinar

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28